



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/782,596 | 02/12/2001 | Nathaniel M. McCully | 07844-413001 / P377 | 9487 |

21876 7590 06/09/2005
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/782,596

Applicant(s)

MCCULLY, NATHANIEL M.

Examiner

Robert M Stevens

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/9/03 / 9/16/04 / 1/25/05 / 1/29/05 / 4/22/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are pending in Application No. 09/782,596, entitled "Method for Aligning Text to Baseline Grids and to CJK Character Grids", filed 2/12/2001 by McCully. Claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 are independent.

2. The Office acknowledges five Information Disclosure Statements filed 6/9/2003, 8/2/2004, 1/25/2005, 1/28/2005 and 4/22/2005.

Priority

3. Applicant claims benefit of 60/182,130 filed 2/12/2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-2, 4-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Neville et al (US Patent No. 5,803,629, filed Mar. 14, 1997 and issued Sep. 8, 1998, hereafter referred to as "Neville") in view of Spitz (US Patent No. 5,245,676, filed Dec. 21, 1989 and issued Sep. 14, 1993, hereafter referred to as "Spitz").

Regarding independent claim 1, Neville discloses:

Art Unit: 2176

A computer program product, stored on a machine-readable medium, comprising instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to:

determine the height of text consisting of a plurality of characters to be arranged within a current line in a grid displayed on a display device; (Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9)

demarcate an arrangement ... if the height of the text is larger than a specified dimension for the grid; (Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9)

set a coordination line within the management region according to a selected coordination mode; (Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9) and

arrange the plurality of characters within the arrangement region while coordinating the plurality of characters with the coordination line. (Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9)

However, Neville does not explicitly disclose:

... :

... ;

... *the current line and at least one subsequent line ... ;*

... ; *and*

... .

Spitz, though, discloses:

... :

... ;

... *the current line and at least one subsequent line ... ; (Fig. 3A-3C)*

... ; *and*

... .

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Spitz for the benefit of Neville, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to determine skew angle, as taught by Spitz in the Abstract and col. 3 lines 60-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., character processing and display.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Neville does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the grid is a frame grid that is movable to a desired position on a page of an electronic document displayed on the display device in order to arrange data to be typeset on the page, the grid having a plurality of lines, each line comprising a plurality of cells.

Spitz, though, discloses:

wherein the grid is a frame grid that is movable to a desired position on a page of an electronic document displayed on the display device in order to arrange data to be typeset on the page, the grid having a plurality of lines, each line comprising a plurality of cells. (Fig. 3A-3C)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Spitz for the benefit of Neville, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to determine skew angle, as taught by Spitz in the Abstract and col. 3 lines 60-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., character processing and display.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 1, Neville further discloses:

wherein the specified dimension of the grid is a font point dimension selected when the grid is created by the user on the display device. (Fig. 16 #116, the Office noting that displaying is well known in the art)

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 1, Neville further discloses:

wherein the coordination mode comprises a top coordination mode, a midpoint coordination mode, a baseline coordination mode, and a bottom coordination mode. (Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9)

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent upon claim 1, Neville further discloses:

wherein each character in the plurality of characters has an associated embox and the maximum dimension of the current line is the dimension of the largest embox associated with the plurality of characters. (Fig. 1 and Fig. 8)

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 6, Neville further discloses:

wherein the embox vertically and horizontally delimits the point dimensions of each character and is an essentially square same surrounding the character glyph. (Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9)

Independent claim 8 is directed to the method performed by the computer instructions of claim 1. As such, claim 8 is substantially similar to claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claims 9 and 11-14 are substantially similar to claims 2 and 4-7, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 15, Neville discloses:

*A desktop publishing system for controlling forced grid line spacing, comprising:
a desktop publishing processing control device provided with a font file,
the font file storing character font information for performing typesetting, and
with typesetting control means having a control means for forced grid line spacing; (Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9)*

*a display device displaying data being typeset; (Fig. 16 #114) and
input means for user input; (Fig. 16 #110)
the control means for forced grid line spacing being arranged to: (Fig. 16
#120)*

*determine whether a maximum dimension of a plurality of
characters to be arranged according to a selected coordination mode ...
displayed on the display device exceeds a specified dimension of the grid;
(Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9)*

. ... ; and

*arrange the plurality of characters within an arrangement space
demarcated by the selected plurality of lines, based on the coordination mode.*
(Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9)

However, Neville does not explicitly disclose:

...:
... ;
... ; *and*
... ;
... ;
... *within a current line of a grid ... ;*
... *select a current line and at least one subsequent line; and*
...

Spitz, though, discloses:

... :
... ;
... ; *and*
... ;
... :
... *within a current line of a grid ... ; (Fig. 3A-3C)*
... *select a current line and at least one subsequent line; (Fig. 3A-3C)*
and
...

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Spitz for the benefit of Neville, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to determine skew angle, as taught by Spitz in the Abstract and col. 3 lines 60-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., character processing and display.

Regarding independent claim 16, Neville discloses:

Art Unit: 2176

*A method for controlling forced grid line spacing, composing:
determining whether a maximum dimension of a plurality of characters to
be arranged according to a selected coordination mode ... displayed on a display
device exceeds a specified dimension of the grid; (Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9)
... ; and
arranging the plurality of characters within an arrangement space
demarcated by the selected current line and at least one subsequent line, based on
the selected coordination mode. (Fig. 1, Fig. 7-9)*

However, Neville does not explicitly disclose:

*... :
... within a current line of a grid...;
selecting a current line and at least one subsequent line; and
...*

Spitz, though, discloses:

*... :
... within a current line of a grid...; (Fig. 3A-3C)
selecting a current line and at least one subsequent line; (Fig. 3A-3C)
and
...*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Spitz for the benefit of Neville, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to determine skew angle, as taught by Spitz in the Abstract and col. 3 lines 60-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., character processing and display.

6. **Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Neville et al (US Patent No. 5,803,629, filed Mar. 14, 1997 and issued Sep. 8, 1998, hereafter referred to as "Neville") in view of Spitz (US Patent No. 5,245,676, filed Dec. 21, 1989 and

issued Sep. 14, 1993, hereafter referred to as “Spitz”) and further in view of Hosoya et al (US Patent No. 5,852,447, filed May 17, 1996 and issued Dec. 22, 1998, hereafter referred to as “Hosoya”).

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Neville does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the grid is a CJK character grid.

Hosoya, though, discloses:

wherein the grid is a CJK character grid. ()

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Hosoya for the benefit of Neville in view of Spitz, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to simply transform character sets, as taught by Hosoya in the col. 1 lines 57-61. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., character processing and display.

Claim 10 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2176

Non-patent Literature

Church, Kenneth Ward, "Char_align: A Program for Aligning Parallel Texts at the Character Level", Proceedings on the 31st Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics, Jun. 1993, pp. 1-8 (plus citation page).

US Patents

| | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Huang | 6,496,600 |
| Kopec et al | 5,956,419 |
| Hassett et al | 5,301,267 |
| Nicholson et al | 5,999,649 |
| Bagley et al | 5,548,700 |
| Statt | 5,221,921 |
| Bugg | 5,015,000 |
| Dominguez et al | 4,893,257 |
| Abe | 4,850,025 |
| Hasselmeier | 4,581,710 |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ~~Joseph H. Feild~~ can be reached on (571) 272-~~4090~~. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. WB

Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Reg. No. 47,972
Art Unit 2176
Date: June 2, 2005

rms

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
6/7/2005